

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In response to a final office action of June 20, 2006 and accompanying the concurrently filed "Request for Continued Examination", Applicant has amended the only independent claim, claim 1, to clarify distinctions between the claimed invention and the cited references of the final office action. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the specification and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Invention Overview

The invention subject to the present Application is a direct antifreeze cooled fuel cell power plant with passive water management that includes at least one fuel cell having a wetproofed anode support and a cathode support for directing reactant streams adjacent fuel cell catalysts. A porous anode cooler plate (26) has its fuel channels (28A, 28B, 28C, 28D) defined on a first surface and a plurality of coolant channels (32A, 32B, 32C, 32D) defined on an opposed second surface, and the anode cooler plate is secured so that its fuel channels are adjacent an anode support (20) to direct the fuel through the anode support to the anode catalyst. A porous cathode water management plate (38) has its oxidant channels (40A, 40B, 40C, 40D) secured adjacent a cathode support (24).

A direct antifreeze solution passes only through the coolant channels (32A, 32B, 32C, 32D) of the anode cooler plate (26) and does not flow through the cathode water management

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

plate (38) so the solution cannot poison fuel cell catalysts (14, 16). Fuel cell product water flows passively through the cathode water management plate (38) and water management channels (44A, 44B, 44C, 44D) defined in the plate (38) to humidify reactant streams and to be discharged from the fuel cell.

An impervious separator plate (36) is secured adjacent the coolant channels of the anode cooler plate for prohibiting movement of the direct antifreeze solution through the separator plate. Pressure control means maintain a positive pressure differential between the fuel stream passing through the fuel channels of the anode cooler plate and the direct antifreeze solution passing through the coolant channels of the anode cooler plate.

By use of the separator plate and the pressure control means, the direct antifreeze solution cannot leave the anode cooler plate to pass through the anode support to contact and poison the catalysts. However, the cathode water management plate permits fuel cell product water to move passively from the fuel cell catalysts into and through pores and water management channels of the cathode water management plate in fluid communication with a fuel cell water discharge to passively humidify the oxidant reactant stream and direct excess fuel cell product water out of the fuel cell power plant.

Extensive usage of the "direct antifreeze solution" of the

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

present invention by the inventor and the assignee of all rights in the present invention in prior art fuel cells gave rise to a need to further limit contact by the direct antifreeze solution on fuel cell catalysts. By use of the combined separator plate, pressure control means, and passive water movement through the cathode cooler plate, the present invention achieves water management of fuel cell product water, humidification of reactant streams, and efficient use of the direct antifreeze solution to tolerate sub-freezing ambient operating conditions without contaminating the catalysts with the direct antifreeze solution.

II. Response to Office Action

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for his generous expenditure of time in telephone interviews of June 21, 2006 and October 6, 2006 regarding the final office action.

By the June 20, 2006 final office action, the Examiner has maintained his rejections of his January 25, 2006 first office action. In addition, the Examiner stated at Section 5, page 5, next to last sentence: "It is also noted that the impervious nature of the separator plate (36) in the instant specification is not recited in the independent claim." By an August 21, 2006 after-final Amendment, the only independent claim, claim 1, had been amended to add the word "impervious" before the phrase "separator plate (36)" at the beginning of sub-paragraph (d) of Claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 5 and 6 had been likewise amended to bring in the word "impervious" before the

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

phrase "separator plate" to be consistent with the antecedent basis for the phrase in claim 1. In an August 30, 2006 "Advisory Action", the Examiner refused to enter the August 21, 2006 Amendment, stating: "the recitation 'an impervious separator plate' in claim 1 is a new issue that would require further consideration and search."

During the October 6, 2006 telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that characterizing the "separator plate (36)" of claim 1 as "solid" would substantially distinguish claim 1 over the reference, U.S. Patent 6,416,891 to Condit et al. (hereafter "Condit"). By the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to characterize the "separator plate (36)" as "being impervious to fluid coolant or reactant". Antecedent basis for this amendatory language is found in the specification at page 9, lines 17 - 22. Because the word "fluid" necessarily means both liquid and gaseous materials, and because the "separator plate (36)" of amended claim 1 now unequivocally prohibits flow of either gaseous or liquid "direct antifreeze solution" through the "separator plate", it is urged that the present amendatory language now clearly distinguishes independent claim 1 over the "separator plate" the Examiner urges is found in Condit. (See Final Office Action at page 4, Section 5, 4th para. lines 7 and 8.)

To the extent that the present amendment to claim 1 could be seen as raising a "new issue that would require further consideration or search" or alternatively as requiring a new

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

search under the present RCE, Applicant urges that this amendment instead simply adds clarifying language that is consistent with the specification. Within the original specification, the "separator plate 36" of claim 1 is characterized as an "impervious separator plate" that is "for prohibiting movement of the direct antifreeze solution through the separator plate". (Specification at page 4, lines 27 - 29; at page 19, claim 1, lines 29 - 31; and, at other locations in the specification.) Throughout the specification the phrases "impervious separator plate 36" and "separator plate 36" have been used interchangeably with reference to only one component in FIG. 1, namely the "impervious separator plate 36". There is no other "separator plate" described in the specification or claims that could permit passage of any direct antifreeze solution through the separator plate. Hence, it was always the intention of the Applicant that the "separator plate 36" of original independent claim 1 is the "impervious separator plate 36" of the specification at page 9, lines 17, 18, or the "separator plate 36" of the specification at page 9, lines 22. In other words, the two phrases "impervious separator plate 36" and "separator plate 36" used in the specification and claims have the same meaning.

Therefore, it is urged that the present amendment to the only independent claim, claim 1, as described above to "being impervious to fluid coolant or reactant", is an amendment that "might reasonably be expected to be claimed" based upon the original specification. (See Manual of Patent Examining

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

Procedure ("M.P.E.P.") Sec. 904.02(a).) Because this amendment to claim 1 is an amendment that could reasonably be expected to be made, it is respectfully urged that the original field of search should have included the now amended claim 1, because as recited in the above cited M.P.E.P. section: "The field of search should extend to all probable areas relevant to the claimed subject matter and should cover the disclosed features which might reasonably be expected to be claimed." (Id.)

By the Final Office Action the Examiner has also responded to the arguments presented by the undersigned on behalf of the Applicant in the April 28, 2006 Reply by insisting that "[t]he water transport plate adjacent to the anode water transport plate [shown in Condit] is considered to be a separator plate that does not allow the passage of antifreeze solution through the plate." (Final Office Action at Section 5, page 4, 4th paragraph.) More specifically, the Examiner asserted "the movement of the direct antifreeze solution is prohibited through the water transport plates. See Column 10, Lines 19 - 38 [of Condit]."

In the April 28, 2006 Reply to the first office action, the undersigned asserted that Condit did not show or suggest an impervious separator plate that prohibited movement of the direct antifreeze solution through the plate, and hence the prior art references did not show or suggest all of the claimed limitations of independent claim 1. Indeed, the present specification referred to Condit and several other "direct

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

antifreeze solution" patents in the "Background Art" section as giving rise to performance that could be improved upon due to some limited contamination of the fuel cell catalysts by the direct antifreeze. (See Specification at Page 2, line 22 - Page 3, line 21.)

More specifically, the Specification pointed out that in operation of the prior "direct antifreeze" fuel cells of the prior art, "movement of fuel cell product water from the cathode catalyst through a 'cathode support means' and into an adjacent 'porous cooler plate' provides a liquid water pathway between the fuel cell catalysts and the direct antifreeze within the porous cooler plate. It is suspected that the direct antifreeze ultimately diffuses through that liquid water pathway to contact and poison the cathode catalyst, thereby decreasing fuel cell performance." (Specification at Page 15, lines 18 - 26. Emphasis added.) The present application solves that problem through use of the "impervious separator plate (36)" on only one side of the fuel cell and by flowing the direct antifreeze solution through only one side of the fuel cell, namely the through the "coolant channels (32A, 32B, 32C, 32D)" defined in the "porous anode cooler plate (26)" and adjacent the "separator plate (36)". (See Claim 1, subparagraphs c and d.). "By the present invention, no direct antifreeze coolant is directed to flow through the cathode water management plate 104, so the direct antifreeze cannot poison the cathode catalyst of the MEA 64." (Specification at Page 15, lines 26 - 30").

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

In his Final Office Action, the Examiner appears to be urging that in Condit, "once the pore volumes of the water transport plates are saturated with the cooling fluid ..., the movement of the direct antifreeze solution is prohibited through the water transport plates" (Final Office Action, at Section 5, page 5, emphasis added.) In other words, by the pore volume of the water transport plates being filled with the "cooling fluid", movement of the direct antifreeze out of the "coolant channels" is restricted.

This reading of Condit misunderstands Condit in a substantial manner. The "cooling fluid" of Condit is the "direct antifreeze solution". As recited in Condit at Col. 10, lines 28 - 33: "By filling the open pore volume of the anode and cathode water transport plate 68, 74, the cooling fluid stream of the direct antifreeze solution forms a gas barrier or seal preventing the gaseous reducing fluid in the reducing fluid fuel channels 82 from flowing into oxidant channels in an adjacent cell." (Emphasis added.) Therefore, while the Condit anode and adjacent water transport plates provide a gaseous barrier, it is clear that the "open pore volume of the anode and cathode water transport plates 68, 74" are filled with "the cooling fluid", and that it is a "cooling fluid ... of the direct antifreeze solution". (Condit, at Col. 10, lines 28 - 30.)

This language of Condit clearly establishes that the aforesaid assertion by the Examiner that "[t]he water transport plates [of Condit] adjacent to the anode water transport plate

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

is considered to be a separator plate that does not allow the passage of antifreeze solution through the plate" is inaccurate. (Final Office Action, at Section 5, page 4.) As recited above, the pore volume of the water transport plates of Condit are filled with a "cooling fluid stream of the direct antifreeze solution..." (Condit, at Col. 10, lines 29 - 30.) The water transport plates of Condit that are filled with direct antifreeze solution coolant therefore provide a liquid continuum that is the troublesome liquid pathway or bridge that permits transport of the deleterious "direct antifreeze solution" to contaminate the fuel cell catalysts. Because the pore volume of the plates of Condit are filled with the direct antifreeze solution, they therefore are not impervious and cannot prohibit movement of the fluid direct antifreeze solution through the plates. In contrast, the "separator plate" of the present claim 1 as amended is "impervious to fluid coolant or reactant", and thereby prohibits flow of the direct antifreeze solution through the separator plate to contact and poison fuel cell catalysts.

Therefore, Condit does not show or suggest a "separator plate" that is "impervious to fluid coolant or reactant" as recited in independent claim 1, as amended. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that Condit be removed as a reference. Because none of the prior art references show or suggest all claim limitations of the only independent claim, it is also requested that Claim 1 be allowed. Additionally, M.P.E.P. Sec. 214.03 states: "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious."

Appl. No. 10/784,473

Amendt./Reply dated 10/19/2006

Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2006 and Accompanying a RCE

Because claim 1 should be allowable for reasons recited above,
it is also requested that the Examiner's rejections of dependent
claims 2 - 7 should also be removed and those claims also be
allowed.

III. Conclusion

By the amendment and argument presented above it is respectfully urged that all of the Examiner's concerns raised in the June 20, 2006 final office action have been resolved. Accordingly, it is urged that that the Application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner remove the rejections of the pending claims under the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination, and issue a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Malcolm J. Chisholm, Jr.
Malcolm J. Chisholm
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,665
Telephone: (413) 243-0551

Date: 10/18/2006

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.